



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the Congress hereby expresses its full concurrence in the declaration of the President in his address to Congress on April 12, 1921, that "We are ready to co-operate with other nations to approximate disarmament, but merest prudence forbids that we disarm alone," and, further, fully concurs in his declared purpose and intention to call an international conference to consider the limitation of armaments with a view to lessen materially the burden of expenditures and the menace of war; and that for the expenses preliminary to and in connection with the holding of such conference the sum of \$100,000, to be expended under the direction of the President, is hereby appropriated.

Congressional champions of the Porter resolution make the point that Congress should go no further than the passage of such a resolution, because disarmament, to become a fact, must be negotiated finally through treaties, and the treaty-making power is in the hands of the President, with only a negative power lodged in the Senate. With some asperity they hold that it would be presumptuous for Congress to attempt to direct the President as to whom he should deal with in negotiating on disarmament or as to the scope of his negotiations. They further hold that the Borah resolution attempts both of those things—telling the President with whom to negotiate, and what armaments to try to reduce, and what period the reduction should cover.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION

Authorizing the President of the United States to invite the Governments of Great Britain and Japan to send representatives to a conference, which shall be charged with the duty of promptly entering into an understanding or agreement by which the naval expenditures and building programs shall be substantially reduced during the next five years.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is authorized and requested to invite the Governments of Great Britain and Japan to send representatives to a conference, which shall be charged with the duty of promptly entering into an understanding or agreement by which the naval expenditures and building programs of each of said Governments, to wit, the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, shall be substantially reduced annually during the next five years to such an extent and upon such terms as may be agreed upon, which understanding or agreement is to be reported to the respective Governments for approval.

Another point made by the champions of the Porter resolution is that in handling the delicate phases of the disarmament question, President Harding will be strengthened by its passage. Saying nothing that adds to or takes from the President's expressions on the subject, the resolution voices approval and support of what has been said, and in view of the negation by the Senate of former President Wilson's negotiations with other nations, and the consequent possibility that foreign statesmen may have some question about the ability of an American President to hold the support of Congress, the sponsors of the Porter resolution think its oneness with the President's views may serve to reassure the men with whom Mr. Harding must deal. That, they argue, will be helpful.

It is taken for granted that Senator Borah will not yield the way to passage of the Porter resolution through both branches without a stubborn contest. He has indicated determination to fight, and if he does so the outcome cannot be definitely forecast, owing to the complications that may arise. However, the political judgment generally is that if the Administration cares to insist upon passage of the Porter resolution it can carry its point.

## THE EGYPTIAN OUTBREAKS

INVESTIGATIONS made by agencies evidently open-minded and fair lead to the conclusion that the Egyptian outbreaks were due to religious animosities, complicated by racial antagonism. Mustapha Kemal Pasha, leader of the Nationist Turks, is credited with having been at work among the Egyptians, through agents. His efforts were directed primarily against the Greeks. The enemy of the Greeks to the east, he reached over Greece, it seems, to stir the Egyptian enmity against the Greeks in the west. That successful, and feeling running high against Greeks living in Egypt, the next and easy stage was the development of religious hatred—Mohammedan *versus* Christian.

The ordinary political feeling, such as that to be found in the clash of ambition between Said Zaghlul Pasha, Egyptian Nationalist leader, and the Prime Minister, Adly Yeghen Pasha, spokesman for the government, is held not to have been responsible for the outbreaks, although the cause of disturbances in the past. That is held to be true, although the first manifestations, outwardly, of the trouble were political, consisting in demonstrations against the Cabinet, and although Said Zaghlul Pasha has issued a statement professing friendship for Great Britain, but attacking the Cabinet and saying conditions can be remedied by its resignation.

Whether, as the well-informed believe, the trouble was racial and religious, rather than political, there is no question that it was one of the most serious upheavals in Egypt in many months. Late reports put the number of Europeans killed at 14 and the number of wounded at 69. Complete reports may run the figures higher. Authentic reports upon the number of natives killed or wounded have not been made, but it is assumed that in fighting so severe the native losses must have been numerous. At one period in the disturbances, it is reported, the rioting was so widespread and so difficult to suppress that it seemed possible the lives of the whole European population in and about Alexandria would be endangered.

Fortunately, the influence of the moderate and more responsible Egyptians began to be felt coincident with the appearance of British troops and the steaming into the harbor of a British warship. Viscount Allenby, not depending alone on military and naval power, has appealed to the native population to turn to peace and conciliation. Keeping free of native party politics, he declared the friendship Great Britain has for Egypt and her desire to see peace and content throughout the land. His effort is stated to have been approved by a substantial element of the natives and to have had beneficent effect generally. It was aided by the moderates among the natives, who deplored at once the violence and the

obstacles it may put in the way of self-determination and self-government.

They fear that the Egyptian delegation, which is to deal with Great Britain for broader rights, will be embarrassed in any event by the outbreak, and very seriously if there is additional trouble. This leads to hope that the order which has been restored, partly through the influence of native moderates, will be maintained in the future through that influence, rather than through British military and naval power, and that the way to peace and progress, political as well as commercial, may be made smoother and more permanent.

## MILITARISTS HAVE BETTER OF FIGHTING IN CONGRESS

Both militarists and non-militarists, the latter including those moved primarily by considerations of economy, won in the skirmishes over the two big military appropriations bills—for the Army and for the Navy—but on the whole, those voting with the military-minded won oftenest.

The Army Appropriation bill, as it passed the House, provided appropriations of approximately \$321,000,000—about the same as the total of the House bill passed in the last session, but given a pocket veto by President Wilson. Carrying that amount, the new bill was not regarded as excessive, conditions being as they are today in world affairs, but, on the other hand, the total certainly was not regarded by those strongly in favor of curtailment of militarism as a victory.

When it reached the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Military Affairs had done with it, the total was up to \$336,000,000, an increase of \$15,000,000, after, as some of the members of the committee thought, important economies had been effected as against estimates from the War Department. The bill was reduced a matter of \$2,000,000 when it reached the floor of the Senate, passing with a total of approximately \$334,000,000, and it was believed that there would be little difficulty in reaching agreement in conference, as to the differences between the Senate total and the House total.

The fighting in the Senate that brought about that reduction of \$2,000,000 in the Military Affairs Committee's report was regarded, however, by friends of reduction of armaments as much more encouraging than the mere figures would indicate. It marked the success of a fight to reduce the size of the Army to 150,000 men, instead of to 170,000, as favored by the committee. The enlisted strength is reported at present as around 215,000 men, so that the reduction to 150,000 indicates the sense of the presumably conservative Senate that nearly one-third of the existing Army can be dispensed with. And, in the debate, several Senators said openly that they would like to see the reduction much greater. The sentiment in the Senate for reduction in the size of the Army was so strong that the motion to make the figure 150,000, instead of 170,000, as favored by Chairman Wadsworth and others, was carried in a set test of strength, after the Wadsworth following had won on an earlier roll-call.

The vote by which the reduction was accomplished was interesting as showing the location of non-militaristic sentiment among the Senators of the majority party. The final vote to reduce to 150,000 was carried by 36 to 32. The 36 votes favoring the Army of 150,000 came from all of the Democrats present, except two, Myers, of Montana, and Fletcher, of Florida, and from 13 Republicans. The votes of the latter, added to those of the Democrats, won the fight. It is thought significant by some that everyone of these 13 Republicans came from a Middle or Far Western State.

The vote in detail follows:

### FOR 170,000 MEN—32.

#### Republicans—30.

Ball,	Hale,	Phipps,
Brandegee,	Kellogg,	Poindexter,
Bursum,	Keyes,	Shortridge,
Cameron,	Knox,	Spencer,
Cummins,	Lenroot,	Sterling,
Curtis,	Lodge,	Sutherland,
Dillingham,	McCormick,	Wadsworth,
Elkins,	McKinley,	Warren,
Fernald,	Nelson,	Watson (Ind.),
Frelinghuysen,	Nicholson,	Weller.

#### Democrats—2.

Fletcher, Myers.

### FOR 150,000 MEN—36.

#### Republicans—13.

Borah,	Kenyon,	Stanfield,
Capper,	Ladd,	Townsend,
Gooding,	La Follette,	Willis.
Harrell,	McNary,	
Jones (Wash.),	Norris,	

#### Democrats—23.

Ashurst,	King,	Swanson,
Broussard,	Overman,	Trammell,
Dial,	Pomerene,	Underwood,
Gerry,	Reed,	Walsh (Mont.),
Harris,	Sheppard,	Watson (Ga.),
Harrison,	Simmons,	Williams,
Jones (N. M.),	Smith,	Wolcott.
Kendrick,	Stanley,	

The outcome of the fighting in the two branches over the Naval Appropriations bill caused much more feeling between the leaders of the two houses. The House passed a bill carrying \$396,000,000, approximately the same as the total of the bill passed by the House in the last session, which failed of enactment in the Senate, owing to opposition of Senator Borah and others to large Senate additions. As the new bill passed the Senate, after being subjected to severe attacks by Senators Borah, Lenroot, King, and others, it carried appropriations for approximately \$494,000,000—very nearly an increase of \$100,000,000, or 25 per cent.

Every indication is that strenuous fighting will occur in conference on this bill. In the Senate is a powerful influence which believes that the Navy is the first and all-important line of defense for the United States at this time, and that it must be pushed and pushed forward. In the House is a widespread feeling that the time has come to slow down, at least, in building. That feeling is reinforced by the calls for economy. And, as members of the House will all go to the people in a little more than one year, while only one-third of the Senate will go at the same time, many members of the House are disposed to insist strongly upon what they believe to be the popular position.